



PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 09/453,055
Applicant(s) : YAMAGUCHI, Eikatsu et al.
Filed : 12/02/1999
TC/A.U. : 1733
Examiner : AFTERGUT, Jeff H.
Title : Method of Forming Honeycomb Sandwich Composite Panels
Docket No. : 32405W027
Customer No. : 25461

Confirmation No.: 2115

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINER'S STATEMENT
OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

In the statement of Reasons for Allowance, it is noted that it was indicated that none of the prior art taught or suggested that those skilled in the art would have employed a thermosetting sealing material consisting of a thermosetting resin film and glass microspheres wherein the hardening of the sealing material took place by heating the sealing material to the curing temperature at a rate of 1° C per minute or less.

While Claims 2, 16 and 17 call for the presence of a glass microspheres component, Claims 24-29 do not specifically call for the present of glass spheres. Instead, and as the Examiner correctly noted, those claims call for the plurality of epoxy resin films and the carrier material (Claims 24-29). In particular, Claim 26 calls for the sealing material which consists of an epoxy resin adhesive film with an epoxy resin film placed between the epoxy resin films. In other words, there are at least three epoxy resin films where the sealing material is hardened by heating to the curing temperature at the indicated rate.

Claim 28 calls for three epoxy resin adhesive films stacked on one side of the honeycomb core.

As the Examiner correctly points out, the prior art does not disclose the elimination of the prepreg layer nor does it suggest the particular configuration set forth in Claims 24-29. If applicants would like to correct the record as far as the response filed November 7, 2003, on pages 7-8, appear to indicate that all claims contained the glass spheres. To correct this, applicants would point out that only Claims 2, and those claims dependent upon Claim 2, specifically call for the presence of the glass microspheres. The

other claims in the case, namely, 24-29, call for a plurality of epoxy resin films and a carrier material used as an adhesive film placed between the epoxy resin films as pointed out in Claim 24 or the plurality of epoxy resin films as pointed out in Claims 26 and 28. Accordingly, applicants wish to correct the record and it is believed that the Examiner clearly understood this distinction as is apparent from the statement of the Reasons for Allowance, particularly found on page 2, with 13 lines on the page.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 

Robert G. Weilacher, Reg. No. 20,531

Suite 3100, Promenade II
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3592
Telephone: (404) 815-3593
Facsimile: (404) 685-6893